

ID	Test Observation Title	Description	DBQ Form	Status	Severity Level	Classification	Observation Comments	Harris Plan for Resolution	VA/UAT Team Response
19	Need ability to select ONLY relevant subordinates instead of having to answer "yes/no".	In many places where one or more choices are required (e.g., 1B Select Heart Conditions), it requires you to select No for all the choices not selected. This is cumbersome—one one choice is selected, any other choices Yes or NO. This is not required on the OMB DBQ—only need to select the ones that are applicable.	General	Open	Medium	Defect	11/14 - Research the design options. This is cubersome as currently designed. Harris will investigate . 2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.	Works as designed. Requirement was to make at least one field required, but this isn't possible without additional scripting. Workaround is to make none of the conditional fields required, which would seem to satisfy the testers. Harris Response to Action: We can create a dummy multi checkbox to demonstrate the reason we did not go with creating multi-checkboxes for such questions. Two examples will be provided.	For discussion - Yes/No radio buttons versus, check all that apply -- 11/29 - CHECK WITH TONY - NON SCRIPTING SOLUTION? 11/30 - Per Tony, the only non scripting solution would be a drop-down list of checkboxes, but this design does not allow for the system to take certain actions based on boxes that are checked (which is required in this case). 12/3 - Review of Out of Scope document - Various requirements to "check all that apply", none are marked "out of scope" 12/19 - Defect. Harris has presented a new design option to meet the requirement -- Option 2 is the desired choice. On 1/9/13 - The VA UAT met with Dick Rickard and presented the proposed design options from Harris. The decision was made to implement Option 2 for forms 61-80. However, Harris has requested that the VA identify ALL of the fields for which this new design option will apply. 2/6 - As of 2/6/13, the fields have NOT been identified and sent to Harris. 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris can implement the new design, but has concerns with not implementing the change globally. Action taken by IT PMO to followup with Harris with a decision on whether or not to implement the new design for DBQs 61 through 82, and item 1B in the Heart Conditions DBQ, based on
50	Text mismatch on screen versus form	In item 4B, the text on the screen does not match the text on the form.	Knee and Lower Leg - VA Form 21-0960M-9	Open	Low	Defect	11/26- Regression Testing Comment: Missing text "Select where objective evidence of painful motion begins" Text mismatch -- Is there any limitation of extension? (0 or any degree of hyperextension) Text mismatch - The 2 list boxes for "Unable to fully extend; extension ends at" include a value of "45" --- it should say "45 or greater; 2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.	Ticket submitted to change wording for Physical Exam Q4B.	ticket opened. 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - The original ticket was for the "45 or greater" issue. The remaining fixes are in queue to be fixed, but Harris does not have a date as to when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.

54	<p>Need option to select all that apply</p> <p>Item 15A, should have the ability to select all that apply instead of "yes/no"</p>	<p>Knee and Lower Leg Conditions - VA Form 21-0960M-9</p>	Open	Low	Defect	<p>11-15 - entellitrak does not have the ability to relate multi-selects fields to another field.</p> <p>Option, can we default to "No Answer" for the fields.</p> <p>Can we use the freestyle format so that the check boxes are all independent check box fields for each. Different designs are available, "stack versus freestyle".</p> <p>Will involve more scripting. VA is looking for the non-scripting options. Harris will research. 2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.</p>	<p>Design Decision because of COTS product ability to place subordinates beneath each selection. See also issue #63.</p> <p>Possible design changes to make subordinate questions NOT required. Harris Response to Action: We can create a dummy multi checkbox to demonstrate the reason we did not go with creating multi-checkboxes for such questions. Two examples will be provided.</p>	<p>For discussion - Yes/No radio buttons versus, check all that apply -- 11/29 - CHECK WITH TONY - NON SCRIPTING SOLUTION? 11/30 - Per Tony, the only non scripting solution would be a drop-down list of checkboxes, but this design does not allow for the system to take certain actions based on boxes that are checked (which is required in this case). 12/3 - Review of Out of Scope document - Various requirements to "check all that apply", none are marked "out of scope" 12/19 - Defect. Harris has presented a new design option to meet the requirement -- Option 2 is the desired choice. 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris can implement the new design, but has concerns with not implementing the change globally. Action taken by IT PMO to followup with Harris with a decision on whether or not to implement the new design for this item, based on feedback from VLER EPMO. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.</p>
72	<p>Increase width of field and remove drop-down menu</p> <p>Under <i>Assessment and Functional Impact, Item 1. Diagnostic Summary</i> the drop down menu for "If no diagnosis of PTSD, check all that apply:" would not be necessary if the size of the field box were widened.</p> <p>o Drop-down menus are annoying if they are not really necessary.</p>	<p>Initial Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)</p>	Open	Low	Defect	<p>2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.</p>	<p>Harris is reviewing to see if we can make a global change to widen many of the smaller text boxes. Harris Response to Action: A global script will be created to widen all text fields and force text to wrap to the next line</p>	<p>See #30 12/6 - Per Harris, the width of drop-down fields can be increased. This is a defect 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Clarifiatiion needed. IT PMO will have to retest to determine what the issue is. IT PMO retested this observation following the meeting. The field for "If no diagnosis of PTSD, check all that apply: " is a scrolloing checkbox field. The checkboxes have a lot of text associated with them, but since there are only 3 checkboxes, the tester is suggesting to widen this field to eliminate the need for the vertical scrollbar. Action for Harris -- Please see the screen shot provided and inform the IT PMO if this field can be widened without scripting, or if an alternate design can be used.</p>

75	<p>Hard to review information entered, due to field width & height</p>	<p>Also under <i>Assessment and Functional Impact</i> , Number 2 (Current Diagnoses), the Comments boxes are hard to review if you type in more than a few words. You have to scroll back and forth horizontally within the box. This will drive examiners crazy. <i>This observation applies to many of the boxes in this section, e.g., 2b and 2c, and in other sections.</i></p>	<p>Initial Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)</p>	<p>Pending Retesting</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Defect</p>	<p>2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied. 2/14/13 - status changed from Open to pending retesting based on Meeting with Haris.</p>	<p>The current Validation Requirement is for 255 characters. A ticket UAT-A18-CJM-01 opened to make the current box larger. See Item response to 72. Harris Response to Action: A global script will be created to widen all text fields and force text to wrap to the next line</p>	<p>This observation was not identified in Harris's list of observations covered by tickets. Is there a ticket open for this? 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris corrected this issue by using a larger text box. This item will be delivered with the fixes for UAT 2, this week.</p>
99	<p>Need larger text fields to review data</p>	<p>Text box for item 6 6. IS THE VETERAN CAPABLE OF MANAGING HIS OR HER FINANCIAL AFFAIRS? If no, explain", needs to be larger so that the user can review the information Like with the Initial PTSD, none of the Comment boxes, History Boxes and Remark section Boxes expand as they did with CAPRI making it extremely difficulty and time consuming to edit these boxes. I think this is a serious flaw that needs to be addressed. In fact, I believe I made these comments on the early draft of these DBQs. From my understanding, fixing this should be relatively simple.</p>	<p>Review Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) - VA Form 21-0960P-3</p>	<p>Pending Retesting</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Defect</p>	<p>2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied. 2/14/13 - status changed from Open to pending retesting based on Meeting with Haris.</p>	<p>Harris is reviewing to see if we can make a global change to widen many of the smaller text boxes. Harris Response to Action: A global script will be created to widen all text fields and force text to wrap to the next line</p>	<p>12/6 - Requires scripting. Harris is working on a level of effort/cost estimate to resolve the expandable text issues. All issues related to expandable text fields will be categorized as defects. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris corrected this issue by using a larger text box. This item will be delivered with the fixes for UAT 2, this week.</p>

116	Question 4A Review PTSD DBQ drop down is difficult to read	The drop down menu for question 4A of the Review PTSD DBQ "which of the following best summarizes the Veteran's level of occupational and social impairment with regards to all mental diagnoses" is too long: one cannot read the choices in the drop down button	Review Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) - VA Form 21-0960P-3	<div>Closed</div> <div>Low</div> <div>DO</div>	Out of Scope	Drop down menu for question 4a of the Review PTSD DBQ is too long - cannot be read 2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied. 2/14/13 - status changed from Open to Closed, and Classification changed from Defect to Out of Scope based on Meeting with Haris.	The length of the text box is due to the inability of the core tool to wrap the text without additional scripting. Additional options are available with moderate scripting effort	discuss options for expandable text fields. 12/6 - Per Harris, the width of drop-down fields can be increased. This is a defect. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - This issue requires scripting. Widening the drop-down to fit all text will cause this field to go off the screen. Therefore, it is a drop-down menu that requires wrapping the text, which is not out-of-the-box functionality. Scripting is required to wrap the text.
-----	--	--	---	--	--------------	---	--	--

138	Request field expansion and modified layout	Medical History Module, Item 3 - Stressors Stressor : it is hard to work with, as you can't see the text. Assessment and Functional Impact Module, 4. Occupational and social impairment · Under diagnostic summary – current diagnosis, recommend making the comments boxes easier to work in · Under diagnostic summary 4 –. this is not a user friendly format. The questions should not be so left centered. You can't see the end of the responses	Initial Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)	Closed	Low	Out of Scope	2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied. 2/14/13 - status changed from Open to Closed, and Classification changed from Defect to Out of Scope based on Meeting with Haris.	Harris is reviewing to see if we can make a global change to widen many of the smaller text boxes. Harris Response to Action: A global script will be created to widen all text fields and force text to wrap to the next line	12/6 - Requires scripting. Harris is working on a level of effort/cost estimate to resolve the expandable text issues. All issues related to expandable text fields will be categorized as defects. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - This issue requires scripting to expand the text box and wrap the text.
144	Request field expansion so that all data entered is displayed	Evidence Review · Evidence review – recommend the box be larger	Review Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) - VA Form 21-0960P-3	Open	Low	Defect	2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.	Harris is reviewing to see if we can make A global change to widen many of The smaller text boxes. Harris Response to Action: A global script will be created to widen all text fields and force text to wrap to the next line	12/6 - Requires scripting. Harris is working on a level of effort/cost estimate to resolve the expandable text issues. All issues related to expandable text fields will be categorized as defects. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris will correct this issue by using a larger text box. Therefore this defect is in queue to be fixed, but Harris does not have a date as to when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.
149	Request field expansion so that all data entered is displayed	2C. DOES THE VETERAN HAVE A DIAGNOSED TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY (TBI)? comments box is not user friendly 2D. IS IT POSSIBLE TO DIFFERENTIATE WHAT SYMPTOM(S) IS/ARE ATTRIBUTABLE TO EACH DIAGNOSIS? if yes, comments box is not user friendly (but it is if you check no...)	Mental Disorders (other than PTSD & Eating Disorders) - VA Form 21-0960P-2	Open	Low	Defect	2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.	Assessment and Functional Impact: Ticket submitted to increase size of text boxes for Q2C and Q2D when Yes is answered. Data validation requirement is for 255 characters for Yes description in 2C and for 100 characters for Yes description in 2D. Current text boxes for Yes accepts 100 characters but only 29 are visible at a time.	ticket opened. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris will correct this issue by using a larger text box. Therefore this fix is in queue to be fixed, but Harris does not have a date as to when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.

161	<p>The use of Yes/No versus checkboxes</p>	<p>Esophageal Conditions - VA Form 21-0960G-1</p>	Open	Low	Defect	<p>For each of these items, the requirements state that the user has to select at least one. Since the user has to answer "No" for each item that does not apply, the user does not see this as having the ability to select only one. he form states "check all that apply", the OTS software constrains the user to yes/no radio buttons forcing them to respond to each one, not only the ones that apply.</p> <p>2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.</p>	<p>Design decision to use Yes/No questions (with restraints of COTS product) for multi-checkbox questions that contain multiple subordinate questions for the selections. Since requirement is to make the question required, each Yes/No must then be set to required to satisfy the requirements. These are for questions that require the user to select "at least" one. Harris Response to Action: We can create a dummy multi checkbox to demonstrate the reason we did not go with creating multi-checkboxes for such questions. Two examples will be provided.</p>	<p>For discussion - Yes/No radio buttons versus, check all that apply -11/30 - Per Tony, the only non scripting solution would be a drop-down list of checkboxes, but this design does not allow for the system to take certain actions based on boxes that are checked (which is required in this case). 12/3 - Review of Out of Scope document - Various requirments to "check all that apply", none are marked "out of scope". 12/19 - Defect. Harris has presented a new design option to meet the requirement -- Option 2 is the desired choice.</p> <p>2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris can implement the new design, but has concerns with not implementing the change globally. Action taken by IT PMO to followup with Harris with a decision on whether or not to implement the new design for this item, based on feedback from VLER EPMO. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.</p>
208	<p>The system does not require the user to select a subordinate option</p>	<p>Diabetic Sensory-Motor Peripheral Neuropathy- VA Form 21-0960C-4</p>	Open	Low	Defect	<p>2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.</p>	<p>Item 3 in Medical History section of the DBQ. This is a design decision due to COTS functionality. Harris Response to Action: Design limitation due to COTS functionality, else marking only one required based on how other subordinates are answered would require scripting.</p> <p>Work around would be to make them not required which would be a change request.</p> <p>We can create a dummy multi checkbox to demonstrate the reason we did not go with creating multi-checkboxes for such questions. Two examples will be provided.</p>	<p>This design decision causes the requirement not to be met. The subordinates are designed as Yes/No, and the system allows the user to enter "No" for all subs, so essentially, it does not require the user to make a subordinate selection. 12/3 - Review of Out of Scope document - requirement not marked "out of scope" 12/19 - Defect. Harris has presented a new design option to meet the requirement -- Option 2 is the desired choice. 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris can implement the new design, but has concerns with not implementing the change globally. Action taken by IT PMO to followup with Harris with a decision on whether or not to implement the new design for this item, based on feedback from VLER EPMO. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.</p>

209	<p>The system does NOT require the user to complete a subordinate value</p>	<p>In item 4C, the system requires the user to select "Yes/No" for "All Normal". If the user selects "No" (not all normal), the system should require the user to enter information for at least one pair (Right/Left) of subordinate values. However the system does NOT require the user to enter any info for the subordinate values</p>	<p>Diabetic Sensory-Motor Peripheral Neuropathy - VA Form 21-0960C-4</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Defect</p>	<p>2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.</p>	<p>Ticket has been submitted UAT-A16-CJM-001</p>	<p>ticket opened. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris has reopened the ticket to fix this issue. However, they do not have a date for when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for this fix, and current development.</p>
210	<p>The system makes ALL subordinate values required instead of "at least one"</p>	<p>Item 4D, when the user selects "YES" for "Was POSITION SENSE tested?" the system makes ALL subordinate values required. The requirement states, "If "Not tested" is not selected then Actor must choose at least one from the subordinate selections.</p>	<p>Diabetic Sensory-Motor Peripheral Neuropathy - VA Form 21-0960C-4</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Defect</p>	<p>2/8/13 - The status for this observation has been changed from "Pending Retesting" to "Open". It was initially marked "Pending Resolution/Regression Test When Available" and was incorrectly labeled when the new status definitions were applied.</p>	<p>In item 4D - Physica Exam Section of the DBQ, This is a design decision due to COTS functionality. Harris Response to Action: Design limitation due to COTS functionality, else marking only one required based on how other subordinates are answered would require scripting.</p> <p>Work around would be to make them not required which would be a change request.</p> <p>We can create a dummy multi checkbox to demonstrate the reason we did not go with creating multi-checkboxes for such questions. Two examples will be provided.</p>	<p>The design does not allow the user to select at least one. The requirement states: 2. If "Not tested" is not selected then Actor must choose at least one from the subordinate selections, but ALL are required. 12/3 - Review of Out of Scope document - requirement not marked "out of scope" 12/19 - Defect. Harris has presented a new design option to meet the requirement -- Option 2 is the desired choice. 2/14/13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris can implement the new design, but has concerns with not implementing the change globally. Action taken by IT PMO to followup with Harris with a decision on whether or not to implement the new design for this item, based on feedback from VLER EPMO. IT PMO may need to define the priority for these fixes, and current development.</p>
214	<p>System should require the user to complete info for at least one nerve, not specifically the Sciatic nerve</p>	<p>In item 5B, the user can enter information for up to 2 nerves (Sciatic, and Femoral). The requirement states that the user must select at least one nerve and fill in the subordinate information. However, the system makes the Sciatic nerve, and all of its subordinates, REQUIRED.</p>	<p>Diabetic Sensory-Motor Peripheral Neuropathy - VA Form 21-0960C-4</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Defect</p>	<p>2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.</p>	<p>Ticket has been submitted: UAT-A16-CJM-002</p>	<p>ticket opened. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris has reopened the ticket to fix this issue. However, they do not have a date for when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for this fix, and current development.</p>

215	Information not correctly displayed on PDF	Diabetic Sensory-Motor Peripheral Neuropathy - VA Form 21-0960C-4	Open	Critical	Defect	2/14/13 - status changed from Pending Retesting to Open based on Meeting with Haris.	Ticket has been submitted: UAT-A16-CJM-003 for items 4D, 4F, and 5A. Item 7B - Could not be reproduced. Signature- When entering in password for signature the correct name appears in the DBQ. On the PDF the signature does not appear as this is an electronic signature for submission purposes.	ticket opened. 2/14-13 - Meeting with Harris - Harris has reopened the ticket to fix this issue. However, they do not have a date for when the fix will be delivered. IT PMO may need to define the priority for this fix, and current development.
-----	--	---	------	----------	--------	--	---	---